arXiv:1403.6629v2 [physics.flu-dyn] 27 Mar 2014

Microrheology with Optical Tweezers: Measuring the solutions' relative viscosity *at a glance*

Francesco Del Giudice,[1] Andrew Glidle,[2] Francesco Greco,[3] Paolo Antonio Netti,[1]
Pier Luca Maffettone,[4] Jonathan M. Cooper,[2] and Manlio Tassieri[2,*]

[1] *Center for Advanced Biomaterials for Health Care @CRIB, IIT, P.le Tecchio 80, 80125 Naples, Italy.*
[2] *Division of Biomedical Engineering, School of Engineering, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8LT, UK*
[3] *Istituto di Ricerche sulla Combustione, IRC-CNR, P.le Tecchio 80, 80125 Naples, Italy.*
[4] *Dipartimento di Ingegneria Chimica, dei Materiali e della Produzione Industriale, Universitá di Napoli Federico II, P.le Tecchio 80, 80125 Naples, Italy.*

(Dated: March 28, 2014)

We present a straightforward method for measuring the fluids' relative viscosity *via* a simple graphical analysis of the normalised position autocorrelation function of an optically trapped bead, without the need of embarking on laborious calculations. The advantages of the proposed microrheology method become evident, for instance, when it is adopted for measuring the molecular weight of rare or precious materials by means of their intrinsic viscosity. The proposed method has been validated by direct comparison with conventional bulk rheology methods.

The pioneering studies of Albert Einstein [1], at the beginning of the twentieth century, introduced what would become one of the most important parameters in the field of rheology: the solution *relative viscosity* (η_r), defined as the ratio of the solution viscosity (η) to that of the solvent (η_s). Einstein derived this expression for a suspension of hard spheres at low volume fractions (i.e. $\phi \lesssim 1\%$): $\eta_r = 1+2.5\phi$. The latter was the spark that led to a myriad of studies (e.g. [2–5]) seeking to find the *yet undefined* laws governing the rheology of highly concentrated (i.e. for $\phi \gg 1\%$) suspensions.

Later, with the advent of polymer physics (followed by the birth of the field of rheology in the 1929), scientists established that for very dilute polymer solutions, the viscosity increases above the solvent viscosity linearly with the polymer concentration, c, and that the effective '*virial expansion*' for viscosity is: $\eta = \eta_s(1 + [\eta]\, c + k_H\, [\eta]^2\, c^2 + \cdots)$, where $[\eta]$ is the intrinsic viscosity and k_H is the Huggins coefficient [6]. The intrinsic viscosity can be seen as either the initial slope of the relative viscosity or as the linear extrapolation to zero concentration of the reduced viscosity $\eta_{red} = (\eta_r - 1)/c$ when these are plotted against mass concentration.

The ability to determine the polymers' intrinsic viscosity from rheological measurements became of great interest to a broad scientific community when it was found that $[\eta]$ is simply related to the polymer molecular weight (M) by means of the Mark–Houwink equation: $[\eta] = KM^{\alpha}$, where K and α are two constants that are tabulated for nearly all linear polymers in various solvents [7].

Conventionally, there are two popular methods for measuring η_r: the first, which is also the most accurate, is performed by using an Ubbelohde viscometer (named after its inventor Leo Ubbelohde), which requires the measurement of the liquids' efflux time through a thin capillary of known geometries; the ratio between the measured times of a pair of fluids is simply proportional to their η_r [8]. The second method involves the measurement of the liquids' steady speed of deformation (i.e. the shear rate $\dot{\gamma}$) occurring as consequence of a known applied constant stress; the ratio between the measured shear rates provides a measure of the relative viscosity of two fluids, if the stress is kept the same in both the measurements.

Despite their simplicity, both of the above methods require millilitres of sample volume (i.e. of the order of tens of ml), resulting in being unsuitable for rare or precious materials such as those involved in biological studies [9, 10]. This emphasises the importance of the *novel* microrheology methods with optical tweezers (OT) for measuring η_r. Indeed, like the other microrheology techniques [11], it only requires few micro-litres of sample volume per measurement, *plus* it provides a straightforward and accurate procedure for measuring the solutions' relative viscosity – and therefore the materials' molecular weight *via* their intrinsic viscosity. This can be achieved by means of a simple *visual* analysis of the normalised position autocorrelation function of an optically trapped bead, with the added advantage of avoiding laborious calculations [12–16].

Optical tweezers have thus proved to be both a valuable and versatile tool for microrheology purposes [15, 17–19]. In particular, it has been shown [15] that the statistical mechanics analysis of the trajectory of an optically trapped bead is able to uncover the fluids' linear viscoelastic properties (over a *wide* range of frequencies) *via* the Fourier transform of either of the following two time-averaged quantities: the normalised mean-square displacement (NMSD) $\Pi(\tau) = \langle[\vec{r}(t+\tau) - \vec{r}(t)]^2\rangle / 2\langle r^2\rangle$ *or* the normalised position autocorrelation function (NPAF) $A(\tau) = \langle\vec{r}(t)\vec{r}(t+\tau)\rangle / \langle r^2\rangle$; where $\vec{r}$ is the particle position from the trap centre $\vec{r}_0 \equiv \vec{0}$, τ is the lag-time (or time interval), $\langle r^2\rangle$ is the time-independent variance of the bead position. Note that, the NMSD and the NPAF are simply related to each other as $\Pi(\tau) + A(\tau) = 1$.

* Corresponding author: Manlio.Tassieri@glasgow.ac.uk

The fluid's linear viscoelastic properties can be represented by its complex shear modulus $G^*(\omega) = G'(\omega) + iG''(\omega)$, which is a complex number whose real and imaginary parts, named as the storage and the loss modulus, provide information on the elastic and the viscous nature of the fluid, respectively. Note that $G^*(\omega)$ is time invariant [6]. Tassieri *et al.* have showed that there is a straightforward relationship between the above quantities, i.e. Eq. (7) of Ref. [15], here expressed as:

$$G^*(\omega)\frac{6\pi a}{\kappa} = \frac{\hat{A}(\omega)}{\hat{\Pi}(\omega)} \tag{1}$$

where $\hat{\Pi}(\omega)$ and $\hat{A}(\omega)$ are the Fourier transforms of $\Pi(\tau)$ and $A(\tau)$, respectively, a is the bead radius and κ is the OT trap stiffness, which can be easily determined by appealing to the Principle of Equipartition of Energy: $k_BT = \kappa\langle x^2\rangle$ written in one dimension. The evaluation of the Fourier transforms in Eq. (1), given only a finite set of data points over a finite time domain, is non-trivial since interpolation and extrapolation from these data can yield artifacts that lie within the bandwidth of interest [15, 16]. Nevertheless, although the above issue has been solved [15], we wish to demonstrate that an important rheological parameter such as the solution relative viscosity can be determined *via* a simple visual analysis of $A(\tau)$; without the need of performing a Fourier transform.

In order to validate the method, we have determined the molecular weight of two known polyacrylamides (PAMs), having molecular weights of 1.5 kDa and 1.145 MDa, both from Polysciences Inc., using their intrinsic viscosity. The latter has been extrapolated from relative viscosity measurements performed with OT on water-based solutions of PAM at different concentrations, as described hereafter.

When an optically trapped particle is suspended in a Newtonian fluid (i.e. a fluid with constant viscosity η), $A(\tau)$ assumes the form of a single exponential decay [15]:

$$A(\tau) = e^{-\lambda\tau} \tag{2}$$

where $\lambda = \kappa/(6\pi a\eta)$ is the characteristic relaxation rate of the compound system (i.e. OT, bead and fluid). From Eq. (2), it is a matter of a simple change of variables to show that:

$$A(\tau^*) = e^{-\tau^*/\eta_r} \tag{3}$$

where $\tau^* = \tau\kappa/(6\pi a\eta_s)$ is a dimensionless lag-time and η_s is the solvent viscosity, assumed to be Newtonian (here this condition is fulfilled because the solvent is water). It follows that, by drawing a horizontal line starting from the ordinate e^{-1}, the abscissa of its intercept with $A(\tau^*)$ provides a *reading* of the solution relative viscosity η_r, as shown in Figure 1 for water and water-based solutions of polyacrylamide ($M = 1.145\ MDa$) at concentrations ranging from 0.1% w/w to 1% w/w. Notably, in the case of pure water, the abscissa of the intercept of e^{-1} with $A(\tau^*)$ is 1.



FIG. 1. (Top) Linear-Log plot of the normalised position autocorrelation function $A(\tau)$ *vs.* lag-time of a $5\mu m$ diameter bead suspended in water and water-based solutions of polyacrylamide ($M = 1.145\ MDa$) at concentrations ranging from 0.1% w/w to 1% w/w. (Bottom) Ln-linear plot of the same data as shown above but drawn *vs.* a dimensionless lag-time $\tau^* = \tau\kappa/(6\pi a\eta_s)$, where η_s is the solvent viscosity, here water ($\eta_s = 0.896mPa \cdot s$). The scale of the ordinate axis has been limited to the region of interest, i.e. $A(\tau^*) \in [e^{-1}, 1]$. Notably, for the case of pure water the abscissa of the intercept of e^{-1} with $A(\tau^*)$ is 1.

It is important to highlight that, in general, polymer solutions are non-Newtonian, especially at relatively high concentrations and Eq. (2) may not be valid, at least not for all concentrations. However, in dilute conditions (i.e., at relatively low polymer concentrations) most of solutions tend to show a Newtonian behaviour, especially towards vanishingly small values of concentration, which *coincidentally* are the same conditions required for measuring $[\eta]$. Hence the applicability of Equations (2) and (3) for measuring η_r.

Figure 2 shows a comparison between the relative vis-

cosities of two sets of PAMs solutions measured with both OT, as described above, and with a conventional stress-controlled rheometer (Anton-Paar MCR-302) equipped with a cone and plate geometry of 50 mm diameter and 1^o angle. The agreement between micro- and bulk-rheology is shown. Moreover, for both the PAMs, the solutions' viscosities obey the theoretical predictions of the concentration scaling-laws for linear polyelectrolytes [7]: i.e., $\eta_r \propto c^{0.5}$ for semi-dilute regime and $\eta_r \propto c^{1.5}$ for entangled regime; with the identification of the entanglement concentration c_e at the transition of the two regimes, for both the PAMs.

Once the solutions' relative viscosities are known, it is a simple step to reorganise the data in terms of their reduced viscosities, as shown in Figure 3. The linear extrapolation to zero concentration of η_{red} provides a *reading* of the PAMs' intrinsic viscosities. These, as introduced earlier, are simply related to the polymers molecular weight by means of the Mark–Houwink equation, which for water-based solutions of polyacrylamides writes [20]:

$$[\eta] = 6.31 \times 10^{-3} M^{0.80} \tag{4}$$

$$[\eta] = 4.90 \times 10^{-3} M^{0.80} \tag{5}$$

where the above two equations are supposed to be valid for PAMs with low and high molecular weights, respectively. In Table I we report the results obtained by substituting the values of $[\eta]$ derived from Figure 3 in both Equations (4) and (5) and compare them with the nominal values of the molecular weights provided by the supplier; the agreement is very good, especially when considered the respective range of validity of the two equations.



FIG. 2. The relative viscosity *vs.* concentration of two water-based solutions of polyacrylamides having molecular weights of 1.5 kDa (bottom axis) and 1.145 MDa (top axis). The filled and the open symbols refer to bulk- and micro-rheology measurements of η_r, respectively. The lines are guides for the gradients.



FIG. 3. The reduced viscosity *vs.* concentration derived from the data shown in Fig. (2). The filled and the open symbols refer to bulk- and micro-rheology measurements of η_{red}, respectively. The lines are linear fits of OT data; the extrapolations to zero concentration of both the fits provide a *reading* of $[\eta]$ for both the PAMs.

In conclusion, we have introduced and validated a simple experimental method for measuring the solutions' relative viscosity with optical tweezers, by means of a visual analysis of the particle normalised position autocorrelation function. The advantages of the proposed method rely not only on its simplicity, but also on its microrheology nature (i.e. it requires micro-litres sample volume), which makes it of great interest to all those studies where rare and precious materials are involved (such as biological studies).

We thank Mike Evans and Miles Padgett for helpful conversations. MT acknowledge support via personal research fellowships from the Royal Academy of Engineering/EPSRC.

$[\eta]$ (dl/g)	Equation –	M (Da)	M (Da)
–	*Nominal*	*1,500*	*1,145,000*
0.022	Eq. (4)	**1,506**	906, 302
3.68	Eq. (5)	2, 066	**1,240,000**

TABLE I. Comparison between nominal and measured molecular weights of two commercially available polyacrylamides. Equations (4) and (5) have been taken from Ref. [20].

[1] A Einstein. A new determination of the molecular dimensions (vol 19, pg 289, 1906). *Annalen der physik*, 34(3):591–592, 1911.

[2] GK Batchelor. The effect of Brownian motion on the bulk stress in a suspension of spherical particles. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 83(NOV):97–117, 1977.

[3] IM Krieger and TJ Dougherty. A Mechanism for Non-Newtonian Flow in Suspensions of Rigid Spheres. *Transactions of The Society of Rheology*, 3:137–152, 1959.

[4] S. Mueller, E. W. Llewellin, and H. M. Mader. The rheology of suspensions of solid particles. *Proceedings of The Royal Society A-Mathematical Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 466(2116):1201–1228, APR 8 2010.

[5] Francois Boyer, Elisabeth Guazzelli, and Olivier Pouliquen. Unifying Suspension and Granular Rheology. *Physical Review Letters*, 107(18), OCT 24 2011.

[6] John D. Ferry. *Viscoelastic properties of polymers*. Wiley, 3d ed edition, 1980.

[7] M Rubinstein and Ralph Colby. *Polymer Physics (Chemistry)*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2003.

[8] D. S. Viswanath. *Viscosity of liquids [electronic resource] : theory, estimation, experiment, and data / by Dabir S. Viswanath ... [et al.]*. Springer,, Dordrecht :, 2007.

[9] Emma J. Robertson, Grace Najjuka, Melissa A. Rolfes, Andrew Akampurira, Neena Jain, Janani Anantharanjit, Maximilian von Hohenberg, Manlio Tassieri, Allan Carlsson, David B. Meya, Thomas S. Harrison, Bettina C. Fries, David R. Boulware, and Tihana Bicanic. Cryptococcus neoformans Ex Vivo Capsule Size Is Associated With Intracranial Pressure and Host Immune Response in HIV-associated Cryptococcal Meningitis. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 209(1):74–82, JAN 1 2014.

[10] Fiona Watts, Lay Ean Tan, Clive G. Wilson, John M. Girkin, Manlio Tassieri, and Amanda J. Wright. Investigating the micro-rheology of the vitreous humor using an optically trapped local probe. *Journal of Optics*, 16(1), JAN 2014.

[11] TA Waigh. Microrheology of complex fluids. *Reports on progress in physics*, 68(3):685–742, MAR 2005.

[12] TG Mason and DA Weitz. Optical measurements of frequency-dependent linear viscoelastic moduli of complex fluids. *Physical Review Letters*, 74(7):1250–1253, FEB 13 1995.

[13] TG Mason. Estimating the viscoelastic moduli of complex fluids using the generalized Stokes-Einstein equation. *Rheologica acta*, 39(4):371–378, AUG 2000.

[14] BR Dasgupta, SY Tee, JC Crocker, BJ Frisken, and DA Weitz. Microrheology of polyethylene oxide using diffusing wave spectroscopy and single scattering. *Physical Review E*, 65(5, Part 1), MAY 2002.

[15] Manlio Tassieri, RML Evans, Rebecca L Warren, Nicholas J Bailey, and Jonathan M Cooper. Microrheology with optical tweezers: data analysis. *New Journal of Physics*, 14(11):115032, 2012.

[16] R M L Evans. Transforming from time to frequency without artefacts. *British Society of Rheology Bulletin*, 50:76, 2009.

[17] Manlio Tassieri, Graham M Gibson, RML Evans, Alison M Yao, Rebecca Warren, Miles J Padgett, and Jonathan M Cooper. Measuring storage and loss moduli using optical tweezers: Broadband microrheology. *Physical Review E*, 81(2, Part 2), FEB 2010.

[18] Daryl Preece, Rebecca Warren, RML Evans, Graham M Gibson, Miles J Padgett, Jonathan M Cooper, and Manlio Tassieri. Optical tweezers: wideband microrheology. *Journal of optics*, 13(4, SI), APR 2011.

[19] Angelo Pommella, Valentina Preziosi, Sergio Caserta, Jonathan M. Cooper, Stefano Guido, and Manlio Tassieri. Using Optical Tweezers for the Characterization of Polyelectrolyte Solutions with Very Low Viscoelasticity. *Langmuir*, 29(29):9224–9230, JUL 23 2013.

[20] P Munk, TM Aminabhavi, P Williams, DE Hoffman, and M Chmelir. Some solution properties of Polyacrylamide. *Macromolecules*, 13(4):871–875, 1980.